

From: [Mairs, Stephanie](#)
To: [Connery, Shannon](#)
Subject: FW: City of Culdesac Consent Agreement and Final Order
Date: Monday, November 16, 2015 9:42:44 AM
Attachments: [City of Culdesac CAFO 022812.docx](#)

Stephanie L. Mairs
USEPA Region 10
Office of Regional Counsel
1200 Sixth Ave., Suite 900
Mail Stop ORC-113
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 553-7359

From: Mairs, Stephanie
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2015 12:05 PM
To: Ogle, Kimberly <Ogle.Kimberly@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: City of Culdesac Consent Agreement and Final Order

First of three Culdesac emails re to FOIA request:

Stephanie L. Mairs
USEPA Region 10
Office of Regional Counsel
1200 Sixth Ave., Suite 900
Mail Stop ORC-113
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 553-7359

From: Stephanie Mairs [<mailto:Mairs.Stephanie@epamail.epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2015 12:04 PM
To: Mairs, Stephanie <Mairs.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: Fw: City of Culdesac Consent Agreement and Final Order

Stephanie L. Mairs
Assistant Regional Counsel
USEPA, Region 10
Seattle, WA

206/553-7359 (w)
206/553-0163 (f)

CONFIDENTIAL: This transmission may contain deliberative, attorney-client, attorney work product or otherwise privileged material. Do not release under FOIA without appropriate review. If this message was sent to you in error, you are instructed to delete this message from your machine and all storage media whether electronic or hard copy.

----- Forwarded by Stephanie Mairs/R10/USEPA/US on 11/10/2015 12:03 PM -----

From: Stephanie Mairs/R10/USEPA/US
To: "City of Culdesac" <cofcul@idaho.net>,
Cc: David Domingo/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Ed Litteneker" <Ed@littenekerlaw.com>
Date: 02/28/2012 03:51 PM
Subject: Re: City of Culdesac Consent Agreement and Final Order

Hi Sharon,

Yes, your understanding of the process is correct. We look forward to receiving the signed order back from you after Council approval.

Thanks,
Stephanie

Stephanie L. Mairs
Assistant Regional Counsel
USEPA, Region 10
Seattle, WA
206/553-7359 (w)
206/553-0163 (f)

CONFIDENTIAL: This transmission may contain deliberative, attorney-client, attorney work product or otherwise privileged material. Do not release under FOIA without appropriate review. If this message was sent to you in error, you are instructed to delete this message from your machine and all storage media whether electronic or hard copy.

▼ "City of Culdesac" ---02/28/2012 03:47:49 PM---Stephanie, The City of Culdesac elected a Mayor in November 2011. He took the oath of office on Jan

From: "City of Culdesac" <cofcul@idaho.net>
To: Stephanie Mairs/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: David Domingo/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Ed Litteneker" <Ed@littenekerlaw.com>
Date: 02/28/2012 03:47 PM
Subject: Re: City of Culdesac Consent Agreement and Final Order

Stephanie,

The City of Culdesac elected a Mayor in November 2011. He took the oath of office on January 9, 2012. I changed the name of the signer on the Consent Agreement to Robert D. E. Sharp, Mayor.

I am sending a copy of the Consent Agreement with the change of signer noted to our City Attorney so a Resolution to sign the agreement can be prepared by his office, then approved at our March 12, 2012 City Council Meeting. I am sending him a copy of this email with the attached Agreement.

Once you receive the signed consent agreement, it is my understanding that we are to await the signed Final Order, and once it is received the the City of Culdesac must pay the \$1,000 penalty within 30 days of the effective date.

Please let me know if my understanding is correct. Thanks for all your help over the past several months.

Sharon Abele
City of Culdesac

----- Original Message -----

From: [Stephanie Mairs](#)

To: [City of Culdesac](#)

Cc: [David Domingo](#)

Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2012 3:10 PM

Subject: City of Culdesac Consent Agreement and Final Order

Hello Joanne and Sharon,

Please find attached correspondence regarding the Consent Agreement and Final Order with EPA.

Please call me at the number below if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Stephanie

Stephanie L. Mairs
Assistant Regional Counsel
USEPA, Region 10
Seattle, WA
206/553-7359 (w)
206/553-0163 (f)

CONFIDENTIAL: This transmission may contain deliberative, attorney-client, attorney work product or otherwise privileged material. Do not release under FOIA without appropriate review. If this message was sent to you in error, you are instructed to delete this message from your machine and all storage media whether electronic or hard copy. (*See attached file: City of Culdesac CAFO 022812.docx*)

BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

In the Matter of:)	
)	DOCKET NO. CWA-10-2012-0072
)	
)	
CITY OF CULDESAC, IDAHO,)	CONSENT AGREEMENT AND
)	FINAL ORDER
Respondent.)	
<hr style="width: 40%; margin-left: 0;"/>		

I. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

1.1. This Consent Agreement and Final Order (CAFO) is issued under the authority vested in the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by Section 309(g)(2)(A) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(2)(A).

1.2. The Administrator has delegated the authority to issue the Final Order contained in Part V of this CAFO to the Regional Administrator of EPA Region 10, who has redelegated this authority to the Regional Judicial Officer in EPA Region 10.

1.3. Pursuant to CWA Section 309(g)(1) and (g)(2)(A), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(1) and (g)(2)(A), and in accordance with the “Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties,” 40 C.F.R. Part 22, EPA issues, and the City of Culdesac, Idaho (Respondent) agrees to issuance of, the Final Order contained in Part V of this CAFO.

II. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

2.1. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. §§ 22.13(b) and 22.45(b), issuance of this CAFO commences this proceeding, which will conclude when the Final Order contained in Part V of this CAFO becomes effective.

2.2. The Director of the Office of Compliance and Enforcement, EPA Region 10 has been delegated the authority to sign consent agreements between EPA and the party against whom a Class I penalty pursuant to CWA Section 309(g), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g), is proposed to be assessed.

2.3. Part III of this CAFO contains a concise statement of the factual and legal basis for the alleged violations of the CWA, together with the specific provisions of the CWA and implementing regulations that Respondent is alleged to have violated.

III. ALLEGATIONS

3.1. CWA Section 301(a), 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), prohibits the “discharge of any pollutant by any person” except as authorized by a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued pursuant to CWA Section 402, 33 U.S.C. § 1342. CWA Section 502(12), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(12), defines the term “discharge of a pollutant” to include “any addition of any pollutant to navigable waters from any point source.” CWA Section 502(6), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(6), defines “pollutant” to include, *inter alia*, solid waste, sewage, sewage sludge, biological materials, and industrial and municipal waste. “Navigable waters” are defined as “waters of the United States.” 33 U.S.C. § 1362(7).

3.2. Respondent is a city duly organized and existing under the laws of Idaho. Respondent is thus a “municipality” as defined in CWA Section 502(4), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(4), and a “person” under CWA Section 502(5), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(5).

3.3. Respondent owns and operates a wastewater treatment facility (Facility) located in Culdesac, Idaho.

3.4. During the times relevant to this action, Respondent was authorized to discharge municipal wastewater containing pollutants from the Facility pursuant to NPDES Permit No. ID 002449-0 (Permit). The Permit became effective on November 1, 2002 and expired on October 31, 2007. The City submitted a NPDES permit application on April 25, 2007 and the Permit is administratively extended pursuant to 40 CFR § 122.6.

3.5. The Facility, which was under Respondent's control at all times relevant to this action, discharges domestic wastewater containing pollutants from Outfall 001 into Lapwai Creek.

3.6. Outfall 001 is a "point source" within the meaning of CWA Section 502(14), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14).

3.7. Lapwai Creek flows into the Clearwater River which flows into the Snake River.

3.8. The Snake River is an interstate water which is susceptible to use in interstate and foreign commerce. Accordingly, the Snake River is a "navigable water" as defined in CWA Section 502(7), 33 U.S.C. § 1362(7), and is a "water of the United States" as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 122.2. Therefore, the Clearwater River and Lapwai Creek are "navigable waters" as defined in Section 502(7) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(7), and are "waters of the United States" as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 122.2.

3.9. By discharging domestic wastewater containing pollutants from the Facility into waters of the United States, Respondent engaged in the "discharge of pollutants" from a point source within the meaning of CWA Sections 301(a) and 502(12), 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a) and 1362(12).

3.10. Section I.A of the Permit establishes effluent limitations for the discharge from Outfall 001. These effluent limits include, but are not limited to, biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), total suspended solids (TSS), total residual chlorine (TRC), pH and *Escherichia coli* (E. coli).

3.11. Section II.B of the Permit requires Respondent to summarize monitoring results for the Facility each month in a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR).

3.12. Respondent's DMRs from January 2007 to August 2011 show that the Facility had 1,272 effluent limit violations of the Permit. When a permittee exceeds a monthly average effluent limit, the permittee is deemed to be in violation of the effluent limit each day of the month in which the exceedance occurred. When a permittee exceeds a weekly average effluent limit, the permittee is deemed to be in violation of the effluent limit for each day of the week in which the exceedance occurred. When a permittee exceeds an instantaneous or daily minimum or maximum effluent limit, the violation is counted as one violation.

3.13. Section I.A of the Permit contains an average monthly effluent limit for TRC in discharges from the Facility of 0.0041 lbs/day. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit 1 time, constituting 30 violations. The violations are as follows:

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
June 2011	30

3.14. Section I.A of the Permit contains a daily maximum effluent limit for TRC in discharges from the Facility of 0.0082 lbs/day. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit 3 times, constituting 3 violations. The violations are as follows:

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
June 2011	1
July 2011	1

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
August 2011	1

3.15. Section I.A of the Permit contains an average monthly effluent limit for BOD in discharges from the Facility of 45 mg/l. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit 4 times, constituting 123 violations. The violations are as follows:

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
April 2009	30
May 2009	31
October 2010	31
August 2011	31

3.16. Section I.A of the Permit contains an average weekly effluent limit for BOD in discharges from the Facility of 65 mg/l. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit 6 times, constituting 42 violations. The violations are as follows:

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
April 2009	7
May 2009	7
April 2010	7
October 2010	7
November 2010	7
August 2011	7

3.17. Section I.A of the Permit contains an instantaneous maximum effluent limit for E. coli in discharges from the Facility of 406 / 100ml. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit 39 times, constituting 39 violations. The violations are as follows:

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
January 2007	1
February 2007	1

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
March 2007	1
April 2007	1
May 2007	1
June 2007	1
August 2007	1
September 2007	1
October 2007	1
November 2007	1
March 2008	1
April 2008	1
May 2008	1
June 2008	1
July 2008	1
August 2008	1
November 2008	1
December 2008	1
January 2009	1
February 2009	1
March 2009	1
April 2009	1
May 2009	1
July 2009	1
September 2009	1
October 2009	1
April 2010	1
May 2010	1
June 2010	1
July 2010	1
August 2010	1
September 2010	1
October 2010	1
November 2010	1
February 2011	1
March 2011	1

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
April 2011	1
June 2011	1
August 2011	1

3.18. Section I.A of the Permit contains an average monthly effluent limit for E. coli in discharges from the Facility of 126 / 100ml. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit 24 times, constituting 729 violations. The violations are as follows:

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
January 2007	31
February 2007	28
March 2007	31
April 2007	30
May 2007	31
June 2007	30
July 2007	31
February 2008	29
March 2008	31
April 2008	30
May 2008	31
June 2008	30
January 2009	31
April 2009	30
May 2009	31
July 2009	31
September 2009	30
April 2010	30
May 2010	31
June 2010	30
October 2010	31
November 2010	30

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
March 2011	31
April 2011	30

3.19. Section I.A of the Permit contains an instantaneous effluent limit for pH in discharges from the Facility of 9.0 standard units. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit in March 2008, constituting 1 violation.

3.20. Section I.A of the Permit contains a monthly average removal requirement for BOD in discharges from the Facility under which the monthly average effluent concentration must not exceed 35% of the monthly average influent concentration. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit 6 times, constituting 183 violations. The violations are as follows:

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
March 2007	31
August 2007	31
January 2008	31
February 2008	29
March 2008	31
April 2008	30

3.21. Section I.A of the Permit contains a monthly average removal requirement for TSS in discharges from the Facility under which the monthly average effluent concentration must not exceed 35% of the monthly average influent concentration. Between January 2007 and August 2011, Respondent violated this limit 4 times, constituting 122 violations. The violations are as follows:

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
August 2007	31

Month of Violation	Number of Violations
February 2008	29
March 2008	31
May 2009	31

3.22. Under CWA Section 309(g)(1), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(1), EPA may assess an administrative penalty when EPA finds that “any person ... has violated any permit condition or limitation ... in a permit issued” pursuant to CWA Section 402, 33 U.S.C. § 1342.

Consequently, under CWA Section 309(g)(2)(A), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(2)(A), Respondent is liable for the administrative assessment of civil penalties for violations at the Facility in an amount not to exceed \$11,000 per day for each violation that occurred on or after March 15, 2004, through January 12, 2009, and \$16,000 per day for each violation that occurred after January 12, 2009, up to a maximum of \$37,500.

IV. CONSENT AGREEMENT

4.1. Respondent admits the jurisdictional allegations contained in Part III of this CAFO.

4.2. Respondent neither admits nor denies the specific factual allegations contained in Part III of this CAFO.

4.3. As required by CWA Section 309(g)(3), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(3), EPA has taken into account the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the alleged violations as well as Respondent’s economic benefit of noncompliance, ability to pay, and other relevant factors. After considering all of these factors, EPA has determined and Respondent agrees that an appropriate penalty to settle this action is \$1,000.

4.4. Respondent agrees to pay the total civil penalty set forth in Paragraph 4.3 within thirty (30) days of the effective date of the Final Order.

4.5. Payment under this CAFO must be made by cashier's check or certified check payable to the order of "Treasurer, United States of America" and delivered via United States mail to the following address:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Fines and Penalties
Cincinnati Finance Center
P.O. Box 979077
St. Louis, MO 63197-9000

Respondent must note on the check the title and docket number of this action.

4.6. Respondent must deliver via United States mail a photocopy of the check described in Paragraph 4.5 to the Regional Hearing Clerk and EPA Region 10 at the following addresses:

Regional Hearing Clerk
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10, Mail Stop ORC-158
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101

David Domingo
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10, Mail Stop OCE-133
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101

4.7. If Respondent fails to pay the penalty assessed by this CAFO in full by the due date set forth in Paragraph 4.4, the entire unpaid balance of penalty and accrued interest shall become immediately due and owing. Such failure may also subject Respondent to a civil action to collect the assessed penalty under the CWA, together with interest, fees, costs, and additional

penalties described below. In any collection action, the validity, amount, and appropriateness of the penalty shall not be subject to review.

4.7.1. Interest. Pursuant to CWA Section 309(g)(9), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(9), any unpaid portion of the assessed penalty shall bear interest at a rate established by the Secretary of Treasury pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3717(a)(1) from the effective date of the Final Order set forth in Part V, provided however, that no interest shall be payable on any portion of the assessed penalty that is paid within thirty (30) days of the effective date of the Final Order.

4.7.2. Attorneys Fees, Collection Costs, Nonpayment Penalty. Pursuant to CWA Section 309(g)(9), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(9), if Respondent fails to pay on a timely basis the penalty set forth in Paragraph 4.3, Respondent shall pay (in addition to any assessed penalty and interest) attorneys fees and costs for collection proceedings and a quarterly nonpayment penalty for each quarter during which such failure to pay persists. Such nonpayment penalty shall be in an amount equal to twenty percent (20%) of the aggregate amount of Respondent's penalties and nonpayment penalties which are unpaid as of the beginning of such quarter.

4.8. The penalty described in Paragraph 4.3, including any additional costs incurred under Paragraph 4.7, above, represents an administrative civil penalty assessed by EPA and shall not be deductible for purposes of federal taxes.

4.9. The undersigned representative of Respondent certifies that he or she is authorized to enter into the terms and conditions of this CAFO and to bind Respondent to this document.

4.10. Except as described in Subparagraph 4.7.2, above, each party shall bear its own fees and costs in bringing or defending this action.

4.11. Respondent expressly waives any right to contest the allegations and waives any right to appeal the Final Order set forth in Part V.

4.12. The provisions of this CAFO shall bind Respondent and its agents, servants, employees, successors, and assigns.

4.13. The above provisions are STIPULATED AND AGREED upon by Respondent and EPA Region 10.

DATED:

FOR CITY OF CULDESAC, IDAHO:

ROBERT D. E. SHARP
Mayor

DATED:

FOR U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY:

EDWARD J. KOWALSKI
Director
Office of Compliance and Enforcement

V. FINAL ORDER

5.1. The terms of the foregoing Parts I-IV are ratified and incorporated by reference into this Final Order. Respondent is ordered to comply with the terms of settlement.

5.2. This CAFO constitutes a settlement by EPA of all claims for civil penalties pursuant to the CWA for the violations alleged in Part III. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 22.31(a), nothing in this CAFO shall affect the right of EPA or the United States to pursue appropriate injunctive or other equitable relief or criminal sanctions for any violations of law. This CAFO does not waive, extinguish or otherwise affect Respondent's obligations to comply with all applicable provisions of the CWA and regulations promulgated or permits issued thereunder.

5.3. In accordance with Section 309(g)(1) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(1), and 40 C.F.R. § 22.38(b), the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality has been given the opportunity to consult with EPA regarding the assessment of the administrative civil penalty against Respondent.

5.4. Pursuant to Section 309(g)(4)(A) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(4)(A), and 40 C.F.R. § 22.45(b), EPA has issued public notice of and provided reasonable opportunity to comment on its intent to assess an administrative penalty against Respondent. More than 40 days have elapsed since issuance of this public notice and EPA has received no petition to set aside the Consent Agreement contained herein.

5.5. This Final Order shall become effective upon filing.

SO ORDERED this ____ day of _____, 2012.

THOMAS M. JAHNKE
Regional Judicial Officer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10